

□ 1300

Why is that? Those of us who have experienced a miscarriage understand this very essential truth. If a woman miscarries, whether it be from assault or from some other reason, that woman has lost one of life's great, great opportunities. A miscarriage is something that a woman never forgets, and it is a major life blow. Whether the woman is 6 weeks pregnant or 6 months pregnant, that loss is acutely felt by women who want to have a child, and it deserves the full penalty that the law can provide and up to a life sentence.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can come together on this substitute. Last Congress there were a number of Members of this House who are anti-choice who voted for the substitute, understanding that the penalties are indeed more severe and it would provide complete protection. I urge those individuals to do so again.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Does the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) claim the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. CHABOT. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the current chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, John Quincy Adams, in a famous summation to the Supreme Court in 1841, spoke on behalf of 35 Africans he represented in the historic Amistad case involving that slave ship. Adams told the Supreme Court they would not have a more important case before them because this concerns the very nature of man.

Mr. Speaker, today we confront the same issue only today it is the unborn whose humanity is being threatened, not the slaves. The question we are faced with is whether a preborn child has value; value sufficient to warrant protection in the law from a criminal assault, or whether the tiny, unborn infant is beneath protection, without value, without standing, without significance. Whether this little unborn is merely a randomly multiplying bunch of cells, a sort of tumor, like Shakespeare's sound and fury, signifying nothing.

A famous novelist, Saul Bellow, once wrote, "A great deal of energy can be invested in ignorance when the need for illusion is great." To rationalize the divesting of the little battered body of the unborn child, divest it of its humanity, its membership in the human family, is the ultimate indignity. My colleagues will not even call him a victim.

In the endless debate on abortion, the term "extremist" is hurled across the aisle. I cannot imagine a more extreme posture than to deny the humanity of the unborn. If you hold the view that the unborn child is without value, you have to explain why this House on July 25, 2000 voted 417 to zero to forbid the execution of a woman while she carries a child in utero. That pregnancy must have meant something. So the fact of a pregnancy makes a difference.

An obstetrician treats two patients when he treats a pregnant woman. Specialists perform fetal surgery of incredible complexity, heart surgery, spina bifida, exchange transfusions, all sorts of surgery to save that baby. How many times has a young couple exhibited proudly pictures of the sonogram? Tell these prospective parents their unborn child is without value.

Mr. Speaker, the Lofgren substitute dehumanizes the child in the womb. It echoes a line from a New York Times editorial yesterday, which cannot bring itself to describe the assault that kills a mother's child in the womb as anything more than "compromising a pregnancy." Have you ever heard a colder phrase describing the death from violence in the womb than "compromising a pregnancy." That is like saying a drug dealer is an unlicensed pharmacist or a bank robber is a holder not in due course.

Listen to the words of a famous obstetrician, Dr. Joseph DeLee, who wrote in the Yearbook of Obstetrics and Gynecology in 1940 as the world was about to be plunged into a bloody war, "At the present time when rivers of blood and tears of innocent men, women and children are flowing in most parts of the world, it seems almost silly to be contending over the right to live of an unknowable atom of human flesh in the uterus of a woman. No, it is not silly. On the contrary, it is of transcendent importance that there be in this chaotic world one high spot, however small, which is safe against the deluge of immorality and savagery that is sweeping over us. That we, the medical profession, hold to the principle of the sacredness of human life and of the rights of the individual, even though unborn, is proof that humanity is not yet lost."

The need for illusion is too great to justify weeding out of the human race the unborn. A pregnancy has not been compromised. A baby has been killed. In the words of Willy Loman's wife, Linda, in "Death of a Salesman," "Attention must be paid." Support Graham, defeat Lofgren.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note for the House Chamber, I am here with my daughter-for-the-day, Laura Wasserman, who is sitting next to me, who is taking the place today for my four wanted children.

Mr. Speaker, I have borne children. I have also suffered a miscarriage; and I would like to say to the gentleman (Mr. HYDE) who just spoke before me who talked in terms of the Lofgren amendment dehumanizing the child, that the underlying bill dehumanizes the woman bearing the child, and I think that point needs to be noticed. We are talking about unborn children, and I take that very seriously. We are also talking about pregnant women who are bearing those fetuses that are about to become children. Mr. Speaker, I think attention must be paid to the mothers.

I rise in support of the amendment offered today by my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), which creates a separate Federal criminal offense for harm to a pregnant woman and specifically punishes violence against her resulting in injury to or the termination of a pregnancy.

If we are trying to protect pregnant women, let us protect them. Let us not insult the intelligence of women in this country by attacking their rights under the guise of protecting their unborn fetuses.

Mr. Speaker, I have read *Roe v. Wade*. It was a decision of the Supreme Court after I was a practicing lawyer. I knew Harry Blackmun, the late Justice Blackmun, who drafted *Roe v. Wade* and whose experience in this area came from his being general counsel to the Mayo Clinic. He carefully defined a framework in that decision that includes a definition of viability of the fetus. The underlying bill here would interfere with that definition and undercut *Roe v. Wade*.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this amendment and rise in opposition to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 503, the Unborn Victims of Violence Act. Once again, opponents of choice are making an attempt to interfere with a woman's right to choose.

Supporters of H.R. 503 claim it increases punishments for individuals who commit violence against pregnant women. They claim it will help protect these women—however, the protection of the pregnant woman is never mentioned in the text of this bill.

Instead, the bill defines an unborn fetus as a person against whom a crime can be committed. It creates "fetal rights." Congress should not be involved in defining when life begins nor should it create "rights" for which we do not know the full repercussions.

I strongly support the alternative offered by my friend and colleague ZOE LOFGREN, which creates a separate federal criminal offense for harm to a pregnant woman and specifically punishes violence against her resulting in injury or the termination of a pregnancy. If we are trying to protect pregnant women, then let's protect them. Let's not insult the intelligence of women in this country by attacking their rights under the guise of protecting their unborn fetuses.

*Roe v. Wade* establishes a careful framework which includes a definition of viability of the fetus. H.R. 503 is a backdoor attempt to